



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/437,535 11/10/99 BREED

D ATI-207

022846
BRIAN ROFFE, ESQ
366 LONGACRE AVENUE
WOODMERE NY 11598

PM82/0618

EXAMINER

TO, T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3619

DATE MAILED:

06/18/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---------------------------------------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

16

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Acknowledgment Of Reply Brief

Application No.: 09/437,535

Art Unit: 3619

The reply brief filed on April 3, 2001 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

In response to appellant's concerning the inconsistency between Office Action, Paper No. 9 and the Examiner's Answer that "claims 20-22, 24-25, 28-30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S. C 102(b) as anticipated by Kaji et al, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C 103(a) *as obvious over White et al*" as written in the Office Action, while the Examiner's Answer is rewritten as followed "claims 20-22, 24-25, 28-30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S. C 102(b) as anticipated by Kaji et al, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C 103(a) *as obvious over Kaji et al in view of White et al*", the examiner notes that the rejection statement in the Examiner's Answer was rewritten with typing error. Therefore, the corrected rejection statement in the Examiner's Answer should be rewritten as followed "claims 20-22, 24-25, 28-30, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (b) as anticipated by Kaji et al, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as obvious over White et al".

TTTo

June 14, 2001


LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600